



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and metrical functions of *hyrde ic* are clearly seen in l. 2163: *hyrde ic þæt þam frætrum feower mearas / lungre gelice last weardode*.⁶

5. Finally, what is the true nature of the paleographical evidence of which so much has been made? As Mr. F. E. Bryant has pointed out (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xix, 121), *heaðo* of *heaðoscilfingas* (l. 63) appears to be written over an erasure, though no letter underneath *heaðo* can be made out with certainty. What conclusion regarding the original reading of the passage can be drawn from this fact? None whatever. The scribe had made a mistake, which he corrected. That is all the erasure tells us. Whether that unlucky scribal blunder which has caused so much headache to modern scholars, occurred before or after *elan cwen*, cannot be learned from it. Nor do we know whether the (first) scribe of our *Beowulf* copy actually committed or merely transmitted it. Besides can we really be sure that what he erased was not simply a blot of ink?

There would be some point in Mr. Abbott's paleographical argumentation if in the original ms. the half-lines had been indicated as such, but this is out of the question.

To sum up. There is no reason to transfer *Hroðulf* from the line of the Scyldings to that of the Scylfings. He is not the son-in-law of Healfdene. The names of Healfdene's daughter and her husband are unknown to us. Of the different names proposed for the daughter, *Elan*, *Sigeneow*, *Yrde*, and for the son-in-law, *Onela*, *Ongenfeow*, *Sæwela*, *Hroðulf*, those of *Yrde* and *Hroðulf* must certainly be ruled out.

FR. KLAEBER.

University of Minnesota.

DID THACKERAY WRITE

Elizabeth Brownrigge?

It is a well-known and curious fact that the authorship of *Elizabeth Brownrigge* has never been definitely fixed; nor have the arguments, for

and against, ascribing that burlesque to Thackeray ever been succinctly gathered and stated, so far as I am aware. The piece in question first appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* for August and September, 1832, and occupies, in all, about forty double-column pages of that monthly. It is dedicated "to the author of *Eugene Aram*," and is a rather clever parody on that romance of criminal life.

Now, if Thackeray wrote *Elizabeth Brownrigge*, it is a significant fact that he nowhere lays claim to it, nor does any one seem to have ascribed it to him until after his death,—a period of over thirty years after its publication. The first suggestion that Thackeray was the probable author of the burlesque was made by Dr. John Brown, in an article reviewing Thackeray and his work, in the *North British Review* for February, 1864, (Vol. xli, 216 sq.). The original Thackeray bibliography, compiled by Mr. R. H. Shepherd, 1880, contained no mention of *Elizabeth Brownrigge*, and the "Works of William Makepeace Thackeray," completed in 1886, failed to include it. The poet Swinburne called Mr. Shepherd's attention to the probable omission from the 1880 bibliography in the unusually guarded statement that "'Elizabeth Brownrigge' . . . ought to be Thackeray's, for, if it is not, he stole the idea, and to some extent the style, [from it, for *Catherine* (pr. 1839)]."¹ Not until 1887, when Mr. Shepherd collected and published "Sultan Stork and other Stories and Sketches by William Makepeace Thackeray," was *Elizabeth Brownrigge* reprinted from the columns of *Fraser*.

That a burlesque showing so much critical acumen and literary skill should remain unclaimed and unidentified so long gives some color to the improbability of its belonging to Thackeray. Furthermore, if Thackeray wrote *Elizabeth Brownrigge*, it is out of all proportion in size and quality to the other productions of Thackeray's earliest literary years, and seems to be a reversal in the evolution of his work. Such an anomaly is, of course, possible, but it is more or less improbable that an aspiring youth of twenty-one should fail to take advantage of the opening which this smart bit of burlesque should have made for him in *Fraser's*

⁶ Certainly the phrase does not point to the composer's "uncertainty of information," as has been supposed (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xix, 121).

¹ Letter from A. C. Swinburne to R. H. Shepherd, dated December 24, 1880. Reprinted in *Sultan Stork*, etc., Intro., p. vii.

columns, particularly since Thackeray was not only gifted in the rôle of burlesquer, (as witness practically all of his writings before and immediately after 1832), but also he was in urgent need, at this time, of employment. Again, to strengthen this view, it would seem strange that one should write for a magazine a story, parody though it be, so sustained in quality and of the length of *Elizabeth Brownrigge*, and not continue to contribute to the same periodical. Nevertheless, with the exception of *The King of Brentford* (a *jeu d'esprit* in imitation of Béranger's *Il était un Roi d'Yvetot*), it is nearly five years after the publication of *Elizabeth Brownrigge* before Thackeray is certainly identified (in the *Yellowplush Correspondence*) as a regular contributor to *Fraser's*. And as a final possible objection to the Thackeray authorship of the burlesque on *Eugene Aram*, it should be noted that another might have written the burlesque story under consideration: Thackeray could hardly have been alone in seeing the weak points in Bulwer's armor, and the tone of criticism in 1832 was so common to the multitude of writers that it is no easy task to determine the authorship of a given piece from solely internal evidence.

On the other hand, favoring the Thackeray authorship, strong evidence might be deduced from a comparison of *Elizabeth Brownrigge* with *Catherine*. While, as a literary effort, the latter is easily the superior of the former, and while the satire is less bitter and the burlesque more open and palatable in the later performance; the purpose, method, and style of the two are identical. Both are particularly aimed at Bulwer; they contain similar expressions characteristic of Thackeray; and, above all, the tenets of 'realism' which Thackeray gradually developed for himself and on which he based his great novels, appear in both burlesques as no one but Thackeray, of all his contemporaries, has expressed them. In the dedication to *Elizabeth Brownrigge* we read the following, addressed to Bulwer: "I am told . . . that in a former work, having to paint an adulterer, you described him as belonging to the class of country curates, among whom, perhaps, such a criminal is not met with once in a hundred years; while, on the contrary, being in search of a tender-hearted, generous, sentimental, high-minded hero

of romance, you turned to the pages of the *Newgate Calendar*, and looked for him in the list of men who have cut throats for money, among whom a person in possession of such qualities could never have been met with at all." And in a note appended to the first chapter of *Catherine* we find this explanation of the author's purpose: "The amusing novel of *Ernest Maltravers* . . . opens with a seduction; but then it is performed by persons of the strictest virtue on both sides; and there is so much religion and philosophy in the heart of the seducer, so much tender innocence in the soul of the seduced, that—bless the little dears!—their very peccadilloes make one interested in them; and their naughtiness becomes quite sacred, so deliciously is it described. Now, if we are to be interested by rascally action, let us have them with plain faces, and let them be performed, not by virtuous philosophers, but by rascals." And more to the same effect. This insistence on novelists representing character as it is in the world is the *motivation* common to *Elizabeth Brownrigge* and *Catherine*; and its expression in both is in Thackeray's vein, as evidenced by numerous others of his literary and art criticisms of the period between 1830 and 1840. Another stricture on Bulwer's practice of reversing the characters of life in his novels may be compared with the foregoing in Thackeray's "Our Batch of Novels for Christmas, 1837," published in *Fraser's* for January, 1838 (Vol. 17, pp. 79-103), in which *Ernest Maltravers* is, for the third time, handled after the same manner. In the same article Thackeray makes the following comment on Mrs. Trollope's *Vicar of Wrexhill*: "Mrs. Trollope may make a licentious book of which the heroes and heroines are all of the evangelical party; and it may be true, that there are scoundrels belonging to that party as to every other; but her shameful error has been in fixing upon the evangelical class as an object of satire, making them necessarily licentious and hypocritical, and charging upon every one of them the vices which belong to a very few of all sects . . ." This is of an exact piece with the quotation from the dedication to *Elizabeth Brownrigge*, and may be traced, in spirit and expression, through the review of "The Duchess of Marlborough's Private Correspondence" (1838), "French Literature" (1833),

“Strictures on Pictures” (1838), “Madame Sand and *Spiridion*” (1839), etc., etc., to mention only examples from Thackeray’s early writings. The aim and execution of the author of *Elizabeth Brownrigg* is in such perfect harmony with the above citations and with qualities that are peculiarly Thackeray’s that, without absolute proofs to the contrary, it does not seem over rash to assign that burlesque to him.

WATSON NICHOLSON.

Yale University.

GOETHE’S *Hermann und Dorothea* AND VOSS’ *Iliad*.

The last six years have produced three editions of *Hermann und Dorothea* by American editors, and a fourth is promised us in the near future. The purposes of the editors is necessarily determined by the needs that the text is designed to meet, and the editions make greater or less pretense of scholarship accordingly. We do not demand a large amount of original investigation for a school edition; a presentation of the most essential facts already known, adapted to the needs of the student is what we may expect and is all that is necessary. A certain amount of repetition of the work of others is inevitable and often desirable; certain things are said by every editor of *H. und D.* and must be said by every successor; indeed, it is often better to quote the words of an earlier editor than to appropriate his thought and present it as one’s own in a mutilated form. And yet even for the editor of the most unpretentious edition there is often opportunity for verification and sifting of the statements of his predecessors.

Among the things that are inevitable in an edition of Goethe’s idyll are references to “the Homeric quality” which pervades it and the student finds numerous citations and annotations to bear this out. For this there is abundant opportunity and justification, perhaps for even more than is ordinarily said. Victor Hehn¹ has

¹ Victor Hehn, Ueber Goethes *Hermann und Dorothea*. Zweite verbesserte Auflage, page 127 ff. Stuttgart, Cotta, 1898.

collected the most conspicuous passages which suggest reminiscences of Homer and Vergil, and most of our modern editions contain them in the annotations. Concerning line 107 of the seventh canto of *H. und D.*, there prevails remarkable unanimity of opinion among the later American editors in referring it to the *direct* influence of Voss’ translation. The line reads:

“In den Brunnen zurück, und süßes Verlangen ergriff sie.”

Hart² has no note on this line.

Hewitt³ annotates:

“An Homeric expression. See *Iliad*, III. 446, Voss’ translation:

“Wie ich jetzt dich liebe und süßes Verlangen ergreift mich.”

Hatfield⁴ makes the following comment:

“Cf. *Iliad*, III, 446:

ὥς σὺ νῦν ἔραμαι καὶ με γλυκὺς ἔμερος αἰρεῖ

translated by Voss:

Wie ich jetzt dich liebe und süßes Verlangen ergreift mich.”

Palmer⁵: “An Homeric expression, fixed in this form by Voss in his translation of the *Iliad*, III, 446:

Wie ich jetzt dich liebe und süßes Verlangen ergreift mich.”

Adams⁶ merely quotes Hewett.

In spite of the positive statement in the annotations of the editors cited above that the line in question was translated by Voss in the form given by them an attempt to verify the quotation was singularly disappointing, for in the Reclam⁷ edition it appears in this guise:

Als ich anjetzt dir glühe, durchbebt von süßem Verlangen.

This failure of the Reclam text to agree with

² James Morgan Hart, Goethe’s *Hermann und Dorothea*. New York, Putnam’s Sons, 1875.

³ W. T. Hewett, Goethe’s *H. u. D.* D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1891.

⁴ James Taft Hatfield, Goethe’s *H. u. D.* Macmillan, New York, 1899.

⁵ Arthur H. Palmer, Goethe’s *H. u. D.* D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1903.

⁶ W. A. Adams, Goethe’s *H. u. D.* D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1904.

⁷ Reclam’s *Universal-Bibliothek*, No. 251-253. Neudruck der ersten Ausgabe, Leipzig.